

EXACT SOLUTIONS OF LOW-DIMENSIONAL REACTION-DIFFUSION SYSTEMS

António M. R. Cadilhe, M. Lawrence Glasser and Vladimir Privman

*Department of Physics, Clarkson University
 Potsdam, New York 13699-5820, USA*

We briefly review some common diffusion-limited reactions with emphasis on results for two-species reactions with anisotropic hopping. Our review also covers single-species reactions. The scope is that of providing reference and general discussion rather than details of methods and results. Recent exact results for a two-species model with anisotropic hopping and with ‘sticky’ interaction of like particles, obtained by a novel method which allows exact solution of certain single-species and two-species reactions, are discussed.

Keywords: diffusion-limited reactions, exact solutions, hopping anisotropy

1. Introduction

There has been much interest in the study of nonequilibrium systems through representation by simple stochastic models.¹⁻³ In particular, low-dimensional diffusion-limited reactions are tractable and in many cases, exactly solvable, examples of nonequilibrium systems. Since the early works of Ovchinnikov and Zeldovich,⁴ Toussaint and Wilczek,⁵ and Torney and McConnell⁶ who pointed out the importance of fluctuations of particle density in the kinetics of low-dimensional reactions, a host of results have been published.¹⁻⁶⁹ Despite their simplicity, common diffusion-limited reactions can describe complex phenomena. However, only recently attention has been turned to the effect of biased diffusion on these reactions.^{7-13,21} Here, we review some common diffusion-limited reactions with emphasis on the effects of biased diffusion in two-species reactions. Single-species reactions will also be briefly reviewed.

The asymptotic diffusion-limited reaction behavior is associated with diffusion being the slowest, ‘rate-determining’ process in the system. For dimensions lower than the upper critical dimension, a mean-field theory using the classical, Smoluchowski-type rate equations—see Kang and Redner¹⁴—breaks down since it does not take into account effects of spatial inhomogeneities of particle concentration. Specifically, the classical mean-field theory predicts, in one dimension ($1d$), for the kinetics of single-species reactions— $A + A \rightarrow A$ and $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$ (inert)—an asymptotic decay of the concentration proportional to t^{-1} instead of the exact result $t^{-1/2}$.^{10-13,15-44} That diffusion is the mechanism leading to anomalously slow kinetics can be illustrated for the annihilation reaction, $A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$, on a one-dimensional ($1d$) lattice, as follows. After a time t , a particle will diffuse over a

distance of order $\ell = \sqrt{Dt}$, where D is the particle diffusion constant. Let us assume that the concentration at time t is $C(t)$, so that the mean distance between particles is $n(t) = 1/C(t)$. In the limit $n \gg \ell$ it is reasonable to assume that particles diffuse freely, i.e., perform independent random walks, and there is no annihilation. In the opposite limit, $n \ll \ell$, it is very unlikely for a particle to actually diffuse over a distance ℓ without being annihilated. Thus the variation of the particle density with time will be determined by the ‘balance’ of diffusion and annihilation achieved when $n(t) \approx \ell$, and we get $C(t) \sim t^{-1/2}$.

Once two particles annihilate, there develops a local fluctuation in the density and correlation functions. The spatial extent of the disturbance is $n(t)$ and therefore the time scale required to erase this local fluctuation by diffusion is n^2/D . However, if $n \approx \ell$, the next reaction event locally will occur on the same time scale! Therefore, diffusion is ineffective in ‘mixing’ the particles and as a result the $1d$ dynamics is truly fluctuation-dominated, non-mean-field. Similar heuristic arguments have been advanced⁵ for the d -dimensional case.

Recent research has been focused on dimensions lower than the critical dimension, where the mean-field description breaks down. In particular, $1d$ problems are usually more amenable to mathematical analysis; in several instances exact solutions have been reported.^{10,11,13,15-25,45,46} Apart from their intrinsic interest, exact results, when available, serve to test theoretical and computational results and methods which are also applied to more realistic problems.

Low-dimensional reaction-diffusion models and related simple dynamical systems actually describe experimental phenomena as diverse as electron-hole recombination in semiconductors, soliton-antisoliton dynamics in quasi- $1d$ systems, evolution of competing species in biology, aerosol dynamics, star formation, and polymerization,^{16,23,47-51} etc. Despite their inherent complexity and diversity such systems share common features—some reviewed below. These ‘universal’ properties can be studied in simple stochastic lattice-dynamics models.

Experimental investigations have been performed on quasi- $1d$ systems.^{47,48,52,53} In such systems the hopping rate in the favorable direction is about 10^4 times higher than in the plane perpendicular to that direction. Therefore, the system can be regarded as $1d$ to a good approximation. Notably, hexagonal crystals of TMMC⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹ represent the best quasi- $1d$ system available experimentally. Excitons propagate preferably along the Mn^{2+} chains, as compared to motion across chains; the latter distance is nearly three times larger than the in-chain separation. The resulting hopping rate between adjacent chains is eight orders of magnitude smaller than the in-chain hopping rate. Typical values for the hopping rates and lifetime are 10^{11} – 10^{12} s^{-1} and $740 \mu\text{s}$, respectively. This large lifetime excludes natural decay of the quasiparticles, which would yield an exponential relaxation, so that the dynamics is dominated by the quasiparticle reactions. It is also a good approximation to consider the reaction time as instantaneous. Indeed, a pair of excitons reacts in about 100 fs , i.e., at least one order of magnitude smaller than the typical hopping time. Theoretical studies of the effects of finite probability of reactions have been

reported in the literature.^{27,37-39} Next, we focus on analytical results for single- and two-species reactions.

2. Some common diffusion-limited reactions

The kinetics of diffusing-particle single-species $1d$ systems reacting via the processes of coalescence ($A + A \rightarrow A$) or annihilation ($A + A \rightarrow \emptyset$) on particle encounters, is now well understood. For these two basic processes the concentration decays for large times according to $C(t) \sim t^{-1/2}$ (in $1d$). In general, $C(t) \sim t^{-d/2}$ for $d < 2$, with a logarithmic correction factor at $d = d_c = 2$, and $C(t) \sim t^{-1}$ for $d > 2$.^{5,10,15-17,19-26,31,35,36} Here d_c denotes the upper critical dimension. The steady state, assuming additional processes, e.g., particle creation or back-reaction, has also been studied by several authors.^{16,26,28,30,36} In particular, Rácz²³ obtained exact results by mapping interfaces of the kinetic Glauber-Ising model to particles in the $A + A \leftrightarrow \emptyset$ system. Amar and Family⁴² pointed out that the Ising-model to reaction-dynamics mapping should be used with caution owing to the presence of subtle correlations in the initial conditions for non-zero values of the magnetization. Multiparticle $kA \rightarrow \emptyset$ reactions, and other variants of single-species reactions have also attracted attention.^{12,18,32,54,55} For $k > 3$, a mean-field approximation applies in $1d$. For the borderline case of $k = 3$, Monte-Carlo simulations⁴³ and refined mean-field treatment⁵⁶ have recently succeeded in demonstrating the logarithmic correction in the concentration decay.

The kinetic behavior of two-species reactions is far richer than that of the single-species reactions. Three two-species models belonging to different universality classes are discussed below. Although there exist other variants of two-species models,^{33,55,57-64} we restrict the present survey to these few examples. In the ‘standard’ AB model particles hop isotropically on a d -dimensional lattice to any of their neighboring sites. On encounters, AB particle pairs annihilate while for AA and BB pairs the two particles ‘bounce off’ each other. This models a hard-core interaction whereby each site can be occupied by at most one particle.

The ‘standard’ AB model shows the non-mean-field concentration decay $C(t) \sim t^{-d/4}$ for $d < 4$ and the mean-field decay $C(t) \sim t^{-1}$ for $d > d_c = 4$, for equal concentrations of the two species.^{5,35,45,46,55,65-67} For unequal (initial) concentrations, the concentration of the minority species decays exponentially as $C(t) \sim \exp(-\lambda\sqrt{t})$ for $d = 1$, $C(t) \sim \exp(-\lambda t / \ln t)$ for $d = 2$, and $C(t) \sim \exp(-\lambda t)$ for $d \geq 3$.^{45,46,65} The seminal works by Bramson and Lebowitz summarize the exactly known results for the $d \geq 1$ ‘standard’ AB model.^{45,46}

A ‘driven’ $1d$ version of the AB model was recently introduced by Janowsky⁷: particles are constrained to hop in one direction only. When combined with hard-core interactions, the biased-hopping dynamics yields a new universality class. Phenomenological considerations^{7,8} relate this reaction model to the asymmetric simple exclusion process, for which the noisy Burgers’ equation represents the continuum limit. Numerical simulations and the above connection to the noisy Burgers’ equation suggest the concentration-decay exponent $\frac{1}{3}$, compared to $\frac{1}{4}$ of the ‘standard’

AB model, in $1d$. Regarding the spatial domain structure, there is only a qualitative agreement in the literature,^{8,9} including phenomenological considerations and numerical simulations.

3. Exactly solvable ‘sticky’ two-species annihilation model

A third variant of the AB model in $1d$ has been introduced recently by Kravinsky.^{50,51,68} In this system same-species particles interact by sticking together. Same-species particle clusters coalesce on encounters—no hard-core interaction is present—and they form a larger cluster with size given by the total number of particles in the merging clusters. When two clusters of different-species particles meet AB -annihilation takes place. The resulting cluster has particle number given by the particle-number difference of the reacting clusters, while the species is that of the ‘parent’ cluster with the larger number of particles. Numerical simulations and scaling⁶⁹ suggest $d_c = 2$.

Synchronous-updating, cellular-automaton-like, ‘sticky-particle’ lattice dynamics models have been considered recently. Exact results have been obtained for ‘sticky’ diffusion-limited single-species,²² and single- and two-species^{10,11} reactions. They have been treated by a novel approach which yields a unified exact solution of the coagulation and annihilation single-species reactions and the ‘sticky’ two-species reaction defined above.¹⁰ The approach combines and extends several techniques developed in charge-coagulation model studies^{70–72} and earlier single-species reaction studies^{21,22} of cellular-automaton-type models. A combinatorial argument is then utilized to relate the ‘cluster history’ at time t to the set of compatible initial configurations (at $t = 0$).⁵¹ Exact solvability for the two-species reaction is based on the linearity of certain dynamical evolution equations, supplemented by a mathematical development yielding a closed form for a non-trivial double-sum.¹⁰

For the single-species reactions the expected power-law decay with exponent $\frac{1}{2}$ was confirmed, regardless of the hopping rate bias. Moreover, for large times (only) the effect of the hopping-rate anisotropy can be fully absorbed in the time dependence, i.e., it only changes the value of the diffusion constant. The method also allows one to extend the exact relation, $C_A(t; 2p) = 2C_\emptyset(t; p)$, where the subscripts represent the reaction outcome and p is the initial particle concentration, to the biased-hopping case. Similar ‘duality’ relations were found in other formulations of $A + A \rightarrow A$ or $\emptyset$ models,^{15,25} with microscopically different dynamical rules, although for the general case they only apply asymptotically for large times.

For the ‘sticky’ two-species reaction, we were able to derive several exact results. The concentration decay, for equal initial concentrations of both species, is $\sim t^{-1/4}$ as in the ‘standard’ AB case. Furthermore, the exponent value $\frac{1}{4}$ is not affected here by the hopping-rate bias as it is for the ‘driven’ hard-core AB model. For unequal initial concentration of the two species, the asymptotic approach to the constant concentration difference is $t^{-3/2}$. This clearly contrasts with the exponential dependence of the ‘standard’ AB model. Thus, for the multiple-occupancy, sticky-particle ‘bosonic’ model the effects of the hopping bias are not fundamentally

important. In fact, in the large-time asymptotic regime the changes due to bias can be fully absorbed in the diffusion constant value. This behavior is quite different from that of the single-occupancy, hard-core ‘fermionic’ models.

To summarize, we have reviewed some common diffusion-limited reactions with emphasis on exact results and our recent exact solution of the ‘sticky’ two-species model. Many open problems challenge researchers in this field. The few exact results available yield insight on the physical problem and provide a guide for approximate analytical and numerical work. We have emphasized the differences between the three two-species reactions considered which actually belong to different universality classes.

References

1. T. Liggett, *Interacting Particle Systems*, (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985).
2. V. Privman, *Trends Stat. Phys.* **1**, 89 (1994).
3. *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics in One Dimension*, ed. V. Privman (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge), to be published.
4. A. A. Ovchinnikov and Ya. B. Zeldovich, *Chem. Phys.* **28**, 215 (1978).
5. D. Toussaint and F. Wilczek, *J. Chem. Phys.* **78**, 2642 (1983).
6. D. C. Torney and H. M. McConnell, *J. Phys. Chem.* **87**, 1941 (1983).
7. S. A. Janowsky, *Phys. Rev.* **E51**, 1858 (1995).
8. S. A. Janowsky, *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 2535 (1995).
9. I. Ispolatov, P. L. Krapivsky and S. Redner, *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 2540 (1995).
10. V. Privman, A. M. R. Cadilhe and M. L. Glasser, *J. Stat. Phys.* **81**, 881 (1995).
11. V. Privman, A. M. R. Cadilhe and M. L. Glasser, *Phys. Rev.* **E53**, 739 (1996).
12. V. Privman, E. Burgos and M. D. Grynberg, *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 1866 (1995).
13. M. Henkel, E. Orlandini and G. M. Schütz, *J. Phys.* **A28**, 6335 (1995).
14. K. Kang and S. Redner, *Phys. Rev.* **A30**, 2833 (1984).
15. D. J. Balding and N. J. B. Green, *Phys. Rev.* **A40**, 4585 (1989).
16. D. ben-Avraham, M. A. Burschka, and C. R. Doering, *J. Stat. Phys.* **60**, 695 (1990).
17. M. Bramson and D. Griffeath, *Ann. Prob.* **8**, 183 (1980).
18. B. P. Lee, *J. Phys.* **A27**, 2633 (1994).
19. A. A. Lushnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **A120**, 135 (1987).
20. V. Privman, *J. Stat. Phys.* **69**, 629 (1992).
21. V. Privman, *J. Stat. Phys.* **72**, 845 (1993).
22. V. Privman, *Phys. Rev.* **E50**, 50 (1994).
23. Z. Rácz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 1707 (1985).
24. G. M. Schütz, *J. Phys.* **A28**, 3405 (1995).
25. J. L. Spouge, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 871 (1988).
26. D. ben-Avraham, Ch. 2 in *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics in One Dimension*, ed. V. Privman (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge), to be published.
27. L. Braunstein, H. O. Martin, M. D. Grynberg and H. E. Roman, *J. Phys.* **A25**, L255 (1992).
28. M. A. Burschka, C. R. Doering and D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 700 (1989).
29. C. R. Doering and D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev.* **A38**, 3035 (1988).
30. C. R. Doering and D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2563 (1989).
31. Y. Elskens and H. L. Frisch, *Phys. Rev.* **A31**, 3812 (1985).
32. K. Kang, P. Meakin, J. H. Oh and S. Redner, *J. Phys.* **A17**, L665 (1984).
33. V. Kuzovkov and E. Kotomin, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **51**, 1479 (1988).

34. J. C. Lin, *Phys. Rev.* **A43**, 5714 (1991).
35. J. C. Lin, *Phys. Rev.* **A44**, 6706 (1991).
36. J. C. Lin, C. R. Doering and D. ben-Avraham, *Chem. Phys.* **146**, 355 (1990).
37. V. Privman, C. R. Doering and H. L. Frisch, *Phys. Rev.* **E48**, 846 (1993).
38. D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3733 (1993).
39. D. ben-Avraham and D. Zhong, *Chem. Phys.* **180**, 329 (1994).
40. Z.-Y. Shi and R. Kopelman, *Chem. Phys.* **167**, 149 (1992).
41. Z.-Y. Shi and R. Kopelman, *J. Phys. Chem.* **96**, 6858 (1992).
42. J. G. Amar and F. Family, *Phys. Rev.* **A41**, 3258 (1990).
43. D. ben-Avraham, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3733 (1993).
44. G. M. Schütz and S. Sandow, *Exclusive Many-Particle Diffusion in Disordered Media and Correlation Functions for Random Vertex Models*, preprint.
45. M. Bramson and J. L. Lebowitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2397 (1988).
46. M. Bramson and J. L. Lebowitz, *J. Stat. Phys.* **62**, 297 (1991).
47. R. Kroon, H. Fleurent and R. Sprik, *Phys. Rev.* **E47**, 2462 (1993).
48. R. Kroon and R. Sprik, Ch. 20 in *Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics in One Dimension*, edited by V. Privman (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge), to be published.
49. G. M. Schütz, *Experimental Realizations of Integrable Reaction-Diffusion Processes in Biological and Chemical Systems*, preprint.
50. P. L. Krapivsky, *Physica* **A198**, 150 (1993).
51. P. L. Krapivsky, *Physica* **A198**, 157 (1993).
52. R. Kopelman, C. S. Li and Z.-Y. Shi, *J. Luminescence* **45**, 40 (1990).
53. R. Kopelman, *Science* **241**, 1620 (1988).
54. V. Privman and M. D. Grynberg, *J. Phys.* **A25**, 6567 (1992).
55. K. Kang and S. Redner, *Phys. Rev.* **A32**, 435 (1985).
56. P. L. Krapivsky, *Diffusion-Limited Aggregation Processes with 3-Particle Elementary Reactions*, preprint.
57. D. ben-Avraham, V. Privman and D. Zhong, *Phys. Rev.* **E52**, 6889 (1995).
58. S. J. Cornell, M. Droz and B. Chopard, *Phys. Rev.* **A44**, 4826 (1991).
59. H. Larralde, M. Araujo, S. Havlin and H. E. Stanley, *Phys. Rev.* **A46**, 855 (1992).
60. H. Schnörer, V. Kuzovkov and A. Blumen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **92**, 2310 (1990).
61. H. Schnörer, V. Kuzovkov and A. Blumen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 805 (1989).
62. A. M. R. Cadilhe and V. Privman, *Exact Solution of an Irreversible One-Dimensional Model with Fully Biased Spin Exchanges*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **B**, to be published.
63. E. Ben-Naim, *Phys. Rev.* **E53**, 1566 (1996).
64. P. L. Krapivsky, *J. Stat. Phys.* **74**, 1211 (1994).
65. K. Kang and S. Redner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 955 (1984).
66. B. P. Lee and J. Cardy, *J. Stat. Phys.* **80**, 971 (1995).
67. H. Simon, *J. Phys.* **A28**, 6585 (1995).
68. P. L. Krapivsky, *Physica* **A198**, 135 (1993).
69. I. M. Sokolov and A. Blumen, *Phys. Rev.* **E50**, 2335 (1994).
70. H. Takayasu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 2563 (1989).
71. H. Takayasu, M. Takayasu, A. Provata and G. Huber, *J. Stat. Phys.* **65**, 725 (1991).
72. S. N. Majumdar and C. Sire, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3729 (1993).